REMARKS

Status Of Application

Claims 16-18 and 34-36 are pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 16, 17, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,179,638 to Dawson et al. ("Dawson").

Claims 18 and 36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 18 and 36 have been rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, as suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to claims 18 and 36 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Amendments

Claims 16, 18, 34 and 36 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

The rejection of claims 16, 17, 34, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dawson, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

As noted in applicant's prior response, Dawson is directed to creating a texture mapped image from digital map images to provide a more realistic image (col. 2, lines 21-45). Data from a digital map unit (DMU) 109 is fed via an elevation cache memory 10 to a shape address generator 12, a symbol generator 38, a geometry engine 36 and a tiling engine 40. The digital image data is converted to screen coordinates (X and Y) and a range depth Z_W that represent the vertex of polygons in the object space (col. 5, lines 58-68). The shape address generator 12 and texture engine 30 combine to provide texture values for each polygon (col. 7, lines 59-65). The texture value and the polygons are rendered by the rendering engine 34 to provide a rendered polygon in screen space (col. 7, lines 49-58, Figures 10A-D). The rendered polygons are provided via the display memory 42 to a video generator 46 for display.

In contrast to the cited references, claim 16 includes:

> an analyzer configured to analyze received code data and to generate image data based on said analyzed received code data ...,;
> a generator configured to generate additional data based on said analyzed received code data; ...
> wherein said received code data is data representing contours of patterns.

In the prior Office Action, it is noted that the elevation data is seen as corresponding to the "received data" in the Examiner's reading of the Dawson reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not show or suggest "received code data is data representing contours of patterns." To anticipate, the cited reference must show, expressly or inherently, every limitation of the claim. MPEP §2131. Therefore, claim 16 is not anticipated by the cited references and is patentably distinct from the prior art. Claim 17 is dependent upon claim 16, and thus includes every limitation of claim 16. Therefore, claim 17 is also not anticipated by the cited references and is patentably distinct from the prior art.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 34 includes:

> analyzing said received code data ...
> generating additional data based on said analyzed received code data;
>
> ...
>
> wherein said received code data is data representing contours of
> patterns.

As noted above, the cited references do not show or suggest that "received code data is data representing contours of patterns." Therefore, claim 34 is not anticipated by the cited references and is patentably distinct from the prior art. Claim 35 is dependent upon claim 34, and thus includes every limitation of claim 34. Therefore, claim 35 is also not anticipated by the cited references and is patentably distinct from the prior art.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 16, 17, 34, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dawson, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

This Amendment increases the number of independent claims by two from four to six, but does not increase the total number of claims and does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, a Response Transmittal and Fee Authorization form authorizing the amount of $ 400.00 to be charged to Sidley Austin LLP Deposit Account No. 18-1260 is enclosed herewith in duplicate. However, if the Response Transmittal and Fee Authorization form is missing, insufficient, or otherwise inadequate, or if a fee, other than the issue fee, is required during the pendency of this application, please charge such fee to Sidley Austin LLP Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin LLP Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By:_____
Douglas A. Sorensen
Registration No. 31,570
Attorney for Applicant

DAS/llb:bar
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Direct: (214) 981-3482
Main: (214) 981-3300
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400
April 6, 2007